

THE UNITY QUESTION REVIEWED.

A Summary, on Behalf of the Friends of Union in Both Parties, of the Efforts Made to Bring About Harmony Among Socialists, of the Obstacles Encountered, and of the Present Situation.

Recent developments in the negotiations for union between the Social Democratic Party and the Socialist Labor Party make it imperative that the Joint Conference Committee submit the following statement, in order that the membership may know the real cause of the attempted breach.

The Joint Committee on Unity consists of eighteen members. Fourteen of them, who are still in favor of union, have always favored union. They spoke, worked, and voted for union in their respective Conventions. They worked and voted for union in the first and second meetings of the Joint Unity Committee. And not one word from pen or lip has come from any one of them at any time that would indicate anything whatever to the contrary.

Precisely the contrary is true of the four members who now oppose union (Berger, Heath, Stedman and Haile.) As we shall show by their own statements, every one of them has always been opposed to an honorable union. They have opposed such union before the Conventions, at their Convention, at the Joint Committee's meetings, and at all other times.

In view of these facts is it reasonable to assume that the fourteen men who have always favored union and still favor it would violate their instructions or break their pledges and thereby defeat their own desires by defeating union? Or is it more reasonable to assume that four men who always opposed union would do the thing best calculated to defeat union and thereby gain the ends for which they have so persistently worked?

We claim the latter to be the case. We will show that the rupture was caused by the four committee members hostile to union, in accordance with a preconceived scheme to prevent union, to absorb the S. L. P., to retain the S. D. P. as then constituted, and to maintain and fortify the powers of the National Executive Board. We will further show that all the reasons assigned by them for the rupture were mere pretexts and false issues raised for the purpose of concealing the real design above stated.

PRETEXTS FOR MANIFESTO.

The arguments by which the issuing of the manifesto was sought to be justified are as follows:

1. The alleged violation of their instructions by the members of the S. D. P. committee.
2. The alleged breaking of pledges by the delegates of the S. L. P.
3. The danger of losing the name "Social Democratic Party."
4. The revolt threatening the S. D. P. on the part of the membership.
5. The alleged spiritual depravity of the S. L. P.

We will take up these matters in their order; we will also show the real reasons and motives for the course pursued by the men who oppose organic union; and finally we will show why the men who oppose organic union of the two parties now advocate political fusion.

In taking up these questions we will quote almost exclusively from the "Social Democratic Herald" and from those who oppose union.

VIOLATION OF INSTRUCTIONS BY THE S. D. P. COMMITTEE.

Margaret Haile says, in the "Herald" of May 5, that the instructions given to the S. D. P. committee were "that the party name shall be submitted to a referendum vote of each party voting separately, and if the name S. D. P. does not receive a majority of each party voting separately the negotiations for union shall stop then and there."

Again she says, in the same article, that "the S. D. P. committee ignored

this instruction and agreed with the S. L. P. committee to submit a third proposition which took the FINAL DECISION out of the hands of our own party and placed it with "the majority of both parties voting together."

This is not true, and Mrs. Haile, above all others, knows that it is not true. Let us quote from the report. The question submitted in the report (see "Herald," April 14) is: "In case the party name voted for by you fails to obtain the concurrent majority of both parties, shall the name receiving the majority of the total vote of both parties be adopted? Vote yes or no." If a majority of EITHER party votes no, this proposition will be defeated. It was upon this definite understanding that she, as well as all the members of the Committee of Eighteen, voted for it. Another evidence that she knew this fact is that every proposition was submitted to a concurrent vote, and she says all propositions except the name which does not receive a majority of both parties "may be re-submitted." There is therefore no excuse for her misstatement. For this proposition was no exception.

F. O. MacCartney, who is also opposed to union and always has been, quotes the proposition in the "Herald," April 14, from the majority report, with the "vote yes or no" left off. He then says that "by this manoeuvre the separate referendum vote might as well not be taken, for the ultimate vote is a majority of both parties voting as one."

This is not a fact. And MacCartney is not mixed, but understands and knows, for he is the man who proposed the concurrent proposition. Also he has read the report as submitted, which appeared in the "Herald" of April 1. This report is not submitted by both secretaries of and for the Joint Committee, but by Wm. Butcher for the S. D. P. Committee and to the S. D. P. alone. Now if the majority of the S. D. P. votes no, that ends the matter; the decision is now and at all time has been in the hands of each party.

Stedman also voted for this proposition, and neither he nor Berger nor Heath nor any other member of the N. E. B. has dared to venture an argument or statement against it except the frivolous one contained in the "manifesto."

Why profound silence on such an important question? There can be but one answer, that argument would develop the facts, and the facts, if known, would remove the objection.

If any Socialists can read and analyze the following statement made in the "Manifesto" without becoming indignant at the misrepresentation, we confess our inability to comprehend such persons. It is as follows:

"We come now to our second point, regarding the referendum vote. One of the most important considerations in deciding on the name by the two parties was the character of the referendum. Your Convention decided that the referendum vote should be taken by each party voting separately. Notwithstanding these definite instructions, the Joint Committee, by a majority vote, deliberately violated the specific directions of your Convention, which it must be remembered was the sovereign power creating the Committee which swept aside the wishes of the Convention. They did this by deciding to submit a contrary proposition to the parties, as follows: 'In case the party name voted for by you fails to obtain the concurrent majority of both parties, shall the name receiving the majority of the total vote of both parties be adopted?'"

No other explanation was made to

the membership by any one who signed the statement. The joint report passed through the hands of the N. E. B., and they knew from that report, if not before, that each party must decide the above proposition as a party "voting separately," and not in conjunction with the other.

They knew this because THEY AS A BOARD SUBMITTED THE PROPOSITION TO THEIR OWN PARTY (see "Herald," April 14.)

Instead of arguing the matter and trying to present the truth to the comrades of the S. D. P., they refrained from all argument and inflamed the suspicions of their membership by the following statements (see "Manifesto"): "The S. L. P. does not know its membership and has studiously evaded giving any definite information concerning it." This is absolutely and maliciously false. Stedman was answered definitely when he asked National Secretary Slobodin as to the membership of the S. L. P. Again (see Manifesto) the N. E. B. says: "A majority of both parties voting as one might be a FICTITIOUS MAJORITY so far as the S. L. P. is concerned."

Without fear of contradiction we are prepared to say that the entire N. E. B., together with MacCartney and Haile, knew that the report of the Committee provides that every proposition, INCLUDING THE ONE IN CONTROVERSY, should receive a "majority vote of each party voting separately," and no proposition could be adopted, not EVEN THE ONE IN CONTROVERSY, without first receiving a "majority vote of each party voting separately." The charge that the S. D. P. committee violated instructions is, therefore, absolutely false and without foundation.

BROKEN PLEDGES.

Fourteen out of eighteen members of the Committee positively deny that the S. L. P. delegates have broken any pledges. Martin, Butcher, Mailley, Chase, and Carey, who were present at the so-called "peace conference," say that they "consider the Manifesto issued by the four members of the N. E. B. to have been uncalled for, and a most unfortunate document, calculated to arouse distrust, suspicion, and enmity without just foundation."

Margaret Haile, while at the first Joint Conference, signed the following statement after all the facts had been disclosed: "I WANT TO SAY I THOROUGHLY BELIEVE THAT THE COMRADES OF THE S. L. P. HAVE NOT BROKEN THEIR PLEDGES."

Now let us analyze the Manifesto in respect to this charge. It contains the following: "As regards name, involving the violation of pledges given to your comrades at Indianapolis by members of the committee of the S. L. P., Messrs. Harriman, Hillquit, Hayes, and Benham." Edwards, in his affidavit, says that "Benham declined to commit himself" if Debs were nominated.

Was Debs nominated. He certainly was. Why then do they charge Benham with a broken pledge? They cannot plead ignorance. But why did Benham refuse if Debs were nominated? For the reason that he did not think it fair for the S. L. P. to concede both the name and the head of the ticket without counter concessions. But Edwards' statement at least shows that Benham is not guilty. And the fact that he is charged gives reason to doubt the truthfulness and sincerity of the charges against the other three.

Hayes, Hillquit, and Harriman now rest under charges.

First as to Hayes. The "Manifesto" (see "Herald," April 7) says Hayes

"had pledged himself to work for the name. * * * this he failed to do."

Max Hayes DID PLEDGE HIMSELF to work for the name S. D. P. And HE KEPT HIS PLEDGE and voted for that name. The minutes show the fact, and at least Stedman and Heath, who signed the "Manifesto," both knew this fact. This will not be contradicted. This fact also gives reason to believe that they were not sincere when they preferred the charges.

But it seems that Edwards also knew that Hayes had kept his pledge, for on March 29, just before the "Manifesto" appeared, he wrote to Abbott of New York, saying that the plan was to "defeat union," "put Carey and the Kaugs in the clear," "pull Harriman off the ticket," "pull Hayes out of the S. L. P. and put him on with Debs."

Hayes having voted and kept his pledge which he really made, he is forgiven, discharged, invited into the fold. But why was the charge made? The fact that it was made is further evidence of insincerity.

Hillquit and Harriman still remain. They agreed to support the name, provided Harriman and Hayes were nominated by the Indianapolis Convention. The reason assigned for such purpose was the same as assigned by Benham and stated above.

Edwards, in his affidavit, says that Berger asked: "If Debs can be induced to accept and the ticket nominated is Debs and Harriman, will you then stand by the name, and will your pledges be good? I have some personal influence with Debs and I am willing to make another effort. I do not know that I can succeed, but I will try, and if he does accept will you recommend only the name S. D. P.?"

Gordon says, in his affidavit, that there was "some discussion." This discussion lasted for more than one hour. Berger said he "did not want to tell Debs that the S. L. P. would accept the name if Harriman and Hayes were nominated, but would fight it if Debs and Harriman were nominated. That would be a reason why he (Debs) should not accept." Chase, who was present at this "peace conference," said at the first Joint Committee meeting that "these promises of Harriman and Hillquit were to stand provided Debs accepted the nomination through the influence of those pledges as presented by Berger. Berger had nothing whatever to do with Debs' acceptance, and hence the pledges were not binding."

The evidence that this was the understanding appears in Gordon's affidavit as follows: "The peace conference adjourned to meet at 11:30 p. m. In the meantime the other conference had succeeded in gaining Debs' consent to accept the nomination; he (Debs) giving his consent at almost the very minute that the peace conference adjourned. Things having been settled to the satisfaction of all, the 11:30 conference was not called, simply because Debs' acceptance had settled everything." It is plain, however, that if Berger had prevailed upon Debs, the "peace conference" would have met again at 11:30 p. m., because of the conditional promises. But the moment it was learned that Debs accepted before Berger saw him, the 11:30 conference was declared off, as Gordon says, and the first conference was considered of no more importance than if it had not been held.

The resolutions passed by the St. Louis comrades April 10, condemning the "Manifesto," point out the fact that the "conference was held after the Convention had given the Committee of Nine its instructions, and it

therefore had no influence on the action of the Convention." And since it has been shown to have had no influence on Debs, it was considered by all as of no importance whatever.

Hence, Hillquit and Harriman are acquitted upon the evidence of S. D. P. members and especially by the affidavits of Edwards and Gordon. There is absolutely no truth in the statement that they have broken their pledges.

THE NAME.

The "Manifesto" says: "The only thing which apparently stood in the way of the definite perfecting of union at Indianapolis was this very question of name. The difficulties in the way in this respect were apparently removed by a solemn compact entered into by Messrs. Harriman, Hillquit, and members of our party at a conference held in the Occidental Hotel, Indianapolis, on the evening of Thursday, March 9."

We have shown above by their own statements that the last paragraph is absolutely false; and we will now proceed to consider this all-important question. The words and actions of the N. E. B. will best betray the real importance they attached to the name. In the "Herald" of April 21, Stedman appears in a long article of almost three columns, in which he says absolutely nothing concerning the MERITS of the NAME. He devotes his entire article to the arousing of prejudices because of the alleged broken pledges, and because "the S. L. P. had attacked the S. D. P. for the last twenty months."

A two-column article in the "Herald" of April 21, over the signature of Jesse Cox, then a member of the N. E. B., and a signer of the "Manifesto," also fails to present the merits of the "ALL-IMPORTANT QUESTION OF THE NAME." Like Stedman, he endeavors unjustly to arouse the prejudices of the S. D. P. comrades, and bases his arguments against union solely on the spiritual depravity of the S. L. P.

Berger appears with a two-column article in the "Herald" of April 28, where absolutely nothing is mentioned concerning the question of the name, but the whole article is most cunning in its malicious representations of the character of the members of the S. L. P.

Heath, another member of the N. E. B., sets forth his reasons against union in a three-column article in the "Herald" of April 12. Like his comrades on the board, he refrains from the discussion of the question of the name. He devotes his entire article to the charges of broken pledges, which have already been disproven both in his presence, and in this article. And he also elaborates on the "spirit" of the S. L. P., which will be considered under the heading of "spirits." Thus we see that all the signers of the "Manifesto," Stedman, Cox, Berger, and Heath, refrain absolutely from any discussion on the merits of the name. Knowing that, in order to gain their ends,—that is, to prevent union—they must conceal the question of name upon which the Convention had already decided, and lead the S. D. P. comrades to believe that the S. L. P. members were vicious and dishonest, just as the "professor" once endeavored to deceive the S. L. P. comrades by telling them that the S. D. P. members were untrustworthy. With them the all-important question was NOT how to RETAIN THE NAME, but HOW TO PREVENT UNION. They will find that they can deceive "all the people part of the time, part of the people all the time, but not all of the people all the time."

A further evidence that the adoption of the name was not the important issue, appears in the fact that Debs, in his letter in the "Herald" of April 21, says: "Now I admit that the name in itself amounts to little and should not stand in the way of union one minute." Why then was the "Manifesto" issued making the name the main issue?

Again he says that the S. L. P. manifests a bad disposition by an "attitude which amounted to this, 'we are going to change our name, but will not have yours.'" Now the fact is that at the meeting of the Joint Conference Committee held in New York, Sunday, April 20, at which Debs was present,

both he and the other members of the Committee who opposed union were publicly informed that the S. L. P. had voted for the name S. D. P., and they were urged to go on with the Committee and affect union; but the four members, with Debs, flatly refused and proposed "political fusion."

There can, therefore, be no doubt that the name was not the issue with any one of the N. E. B.; but the important issue was: How can we defeat union, and yet shirk the responsibility?

"THE THUNDERING REVOLT."

Debs says, in his letter in the "Herald" of April 21: "The purport of the report had gone out. It had struck the party with the effect of a lightning stroke, and revolt threatened instantaneously." The "Manifesto" says: "Prompt action is demanded by the exigencies of the case because the spirit of revolt is already thundering at our doors."

These were the reasons assigned for the appearance of the "Manifesto." Are the statements true? And had the N. E. B. any legal right to issue such a document even though the statements were true? This can best be determined by an analysis of the vote.

The "Manifesto" states that "THE CONVENTION, IT MUST BE REMEMBERED, WAS ESSENTIALLY A MASS CONVENTION, over 2,100 individual credentials having been handed in." This mass convention of the party, at a time when no false issues were before it, elected a Committee of Nine and instructed them to confer with the S. L. P. Committee of Nine, and to submit the result of their deliberations to a referendum vote of the party for approval or disapproval. The Committee did its work according as they were ordered by the party in mass convention.

The N. E. B., which was elected by the same body and for a different purpose, took the affairs of the party out of the hands of the party for the purpose of "saving the party" from a "thundering revolt" of the party. They raised false issues and misrepresented both the S. L. P. delegates and the party at large, and called for a snap vote, not on our Committee's report, but practically upon their own misrepresentations, namely, is union desirable if the S. L. P. is really saturated with "virus," "hate," "contempt," "intolerance," "fanaticism," "falsehood," if they are "hawks," "wolves," and "deceitful?" And with what enthusiasm did this "thundering revolt," answer this question? It was answered with only 2,152 votes out of a membership of 5,000. A majority of only 274 decided that, if the above accusations are true, union is not desirable. This is a smaller majority than was given by the party in Convention on the minority report and on the instructions to the Committee of Nine.

Was it really a revolt of the membership or a revolt of the N. E. B.? But it will be argued that the membership had reconsidered the matter. Let us further analyze this vote. The vote shows only 32 more than were represented in the Convention, and less than one-half of the membership as reported by the National Secretary. Twenty-nine (29) states and territories are tabulated in the S. D. P. vote. Fifteen show a majority for union, including Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, California. Fourteen show a majority against. Of the fifteen for union eleven had delegates to the convention. Of the fourteen against only four sent delegates to the convention. This shows that the power of the N. E. B. is in the states which are not well organized, and where the membership depends for information largely upon the "Herald." But a still more important fact is that every state represented in the convention has cast a smaller vote for the "Manifesto" than it cast in the convention, except one state alone, namely, Wisconsin, which cast 373 votes for the manifesto and 193 in the convention. This is Berger's state. The meaning of this is that the well organized states which were represented in the convention refused to vote in part, preferring to vote

on the report of their Committee of Nine. The membership were not told that their vote on the report of the Committee of Nine would not be counted if the "Manifesto" was indorsed, but they were led to believe to the contrary. The report was printed in the "Herald," and there was absolutely no indication that it would be withdrawn, but on the contrary the membership were led to believe by various statements that the report was submitted and the vote upon it would be taken. Debs, in his letter (see "Herald," April 21), said: "I shall vote against union AND ALSO AGAINST THE REPORT OF THE MAJORITY, and use my best efforts to defeat both." But at present the N. E. B., Debs included, declare the Committee of Nine to be discharged and refuse to count the vote on the report of the Joint Conference Committee. But this is not all. The press was in favor of union. The Haverhill "Social Democrat," "Public Ownership," "Farmers' Review," St. Louis "Arbeiter Zeitung" were outspoken in favor of union, while only the "Herald" and the "Wahrheit" were opposed. But the opposition did not stop with the press. The vote was called for May 7. The "Manifesto" was issued April 7. During the first three weeks when the vote was being determined, the "Herald" printed about twenty columns in support of the "Manifesto" and only eight against it. Though all the party papers above mentioned were outspoken, the "Herald" never intimated the fact to the S. D. P. membership. Though there were numbers of resolutions being passed by branches in every quarter of the country, they were not reproduced nor mentioned until on or after April 28. The vote was to be on May 7. The eight columns opposing the "Manifesto" were used in printing Hayes', Benham's, Hillquit's, and Harriman's letters, which were replies to the charges preferred in the "Manifesto." All the twenty columns had been written by the members of the N. E. B., and Edwards and MacCartney. The tide was strong against the "Manifesto" and the opposition continued to grow with unabated indignation. The facts show that 21 votes from New York and 24 votes from Dayton, O., against the "Manifesto" have not found their way to the tabulation sheet and the surprisingly large vote in Wisconsin makes the suggestion of a "fictitious majority so far as the S. L. P. is concerned" look a little as if their suggestion might not have sprung from a pure spiritual fountain. If the N. E. B. proposed to persist in its course, the "revolt thundering at its doors" made prompt action about April 21 even more necessary than it was on April 7, when the "Manifesto" was issued. Had their prompt action not been taken at this time the "Manifesto" would have been almost unanimously defeated, and in all probability the four members of the N. E. B. would have been recalled. The fact that all the articles appearing in the "Herald" up to April 28 were written by members of the N. E. B. and Edwards and MacCartney, and the fact that all the papers were against them, and that opposition resolutions and letters were raining upon them, established the fact that the "Manifesto" was really caused by a revolt of the N. E. B. against the action of the Indianapolis Convention, and not a revolt of the membership against the acts of their Committee of Nine.

But what was this prompt action which was within their power, and which was so boldly taken, and which alone saved them from an immediate downfall and prolonged their term of power for yet awhile. It must be remembered that one member of the N. E. B. had not yet spoken. His influence in the S. D. P. was far greater than that of any other living man. His influence had been enormously increased by his nomination in Indianapolis and again was his influence increased when the Joint Conference Committee nominated him for the head of the ticket of the proposed united party. It was for him to remain quiet and let the flood of enthusiasm, then surging in the ranks of both parties, flow beautifully

on into one great and irresistible stream, or for him to stand at the place where they were about meeting, and by the power of his position in which his comrades had placed him, stem the tide, turn the streams in opposite directions, and thereby inflict an irreparable injury upon the Socialist movement of America. It was with breathless anxiety that we all waited for him to take a stand in the controversy. He did, and the indignant revolt of the party against the N. E. B. was allayed.

But what were the reasons assigned by Debs for sustaining the action of the N. E. B.? Was it not the name which was made the reason for issuing the "Manifesto?" No! For Debs says in his letter in the "Herald" of April 21 that "I confess that the name is of little importance, and should not stand in the way of union one minute." Then, too, he said he had read Hillquit's and Harriman's letter which was in the same issue, and was doubtless convinced by their statement "that the question of name would be submitted to a SEPARATE vote of each party, and that the S. D. P. was not bound by the decision of the S. L. P." For this reason he did not sustain the charge that the S. D. P. committee had violated their instructions. Was the letter based upon the charge of broken pledges? Not at all. For he said that "after a careful survey of the entire situation, and the maturest deliberation of which I am capable * * * I shall not now charge the S. L. P. delegates with violating their pledges." But these were the only propositions contained in the "Manifesto." Since he did not indorse it, the question is why and how did he support it? What were his grounds?

Debs says: "I take my grounds against union of the parties on the basis proposed by the New York Conference.

"Second. It is the spirit of the S. L. P., with which I have to deal, and it is this that largely forms the basis of my opposition to union."

As to the first proposition. We cannot understand why he offers absolutely no argument concerning it. Neither is his opposition well grounded, for the reason that it was provided by the S. D. P. Convention that all propositions except that of name, which failed to receive a "majority vote of each party voting separately should be submitted a second time, or other propositions in their stead should be submitted."

THE SPIRIT.

Since this position is unsound let us consider the second proposition, namely, the "Spirit" of the S. L. P., for it is this that largely "forms the basis of his (Debs) opposition to union." Let us bunch his own statements, and see how they appear as they stand side by side. He says: "The S. L. P. was trained in the bitter school of bigotry and intolerance. It must preserve an air frigidly scientific. Emotion and sentiment must be banished. Hard and stern are the party methods, and it must be confined strictly to the working class. Tolerance is a crime. Members must suspicion each other, and rows must occur at such intervals as to prevent the party from getting beyond the bounds of a mere faction. It has taken years to cultivate and to intensify this spirit that has dwarfed Socialism in America and it CANNOT BE OVERCOME IN A DAY, nor by resolutions passed in a conference."

Diametrically opposed to this is the spirit of the S. D. P. Better far to keep them in separate parties until the logic of events has ripened them for union. I propose to stand by the Social Democratic Party until conditions favor a united party, and my judgment is that this consummation will not be deferred long after the national election."

Are we to believe that the S. L. P. comrades are unfit for comradeship to-day because they are saturated with "virus" or "hate," "contempt," "intolerance," "fanaticism," "bigotry," and "suspicion," which "it has taken years to cultivate, and which cannot be overcome in a day, and whose "spirit" is irreconcilably in conflict with that of

the S. D. P., and will the members be fit for comradeship, in a few short months, just after election? The contradiction is so glaring that we are forced to a little further examination. Again when a man accuses an organization of 5,000 members of "bigotry," "suspicion," "intolerance," "hate," is not the accusation itself conclusive evidence that the accuser is tintured with a little of the "virus of hate?"

Again Debs says in the "Herald," January 20: "While no one can be more desirous for a united party of Socialists than I, it is my SETTLED conviction that the hour for such a consummation has not yet arrived." Again: "There is an element in that S. L. P. faction, by no means insignificant, with whom we can have no affiliation without disruption." Again speaking of a letter for which he knows that the party and the editor disclaims any responsibility, he says: "I care nothing about these lies, nor their craven authors, but I want no affiliation with such serpents of defamation."

Debs will hunt a long while before he finds any such bitterness in the columns of the S. L. P. papers since July 10, 1899. But if on January 14 there could be "NO AFFILIATION without inviting disruption" to the S. D. P., why did Debs indorse that letter to the Rochester Convention, "extending a hearty invitation to your Convention and to all the members of the S. L. P. to join the S. D. P.?"

Again: "The anti-De Leon party has not had its last purging." It is pretty safe to say that neither has the S. D. P. had its last purging, unless methods are changed in Chicago.

Again: "They hated De Leon, not because of his principles or lack of principles, but because he was their master at their own game." Is it possible that this is a specimen of "high-minded spiritual toleration," as Debs sees it? We regret beyond measure to find it over his signature. But "'tis true, 'tis pity and pity 'tis 'tis true."

And 'tis pity that the following is true: Edwards, editor of the "Herald," the S. D. P. organ, wrote a letter to Leonard D. Abbott, dated March 29 (which was before they could have known the real merits of the Joint Committee report), and which contained the following in substance: "Defeat union, pull Harriman off the ticket, put Carey and the Kangs in the clear, pull Hayes out of the S. L. P. and put him on with Debs." A copy of this letter was sent to Debs by Martin of Ohio, and it was returned to him with no word of protest then or thereafter. Is this "high-minded spiritual toleration?"

Let us see if this "virus" is found elsewhere. In the "Herald" of May 5, Mrs. Haile says, in speaking of the action of the S. L. P. on union: "It reminds one of a hungry wolf eager to unite himself with a lamb."

Berger says: "Before all things permit me to say that I have studied the S. L. P. and its methods for years. * * * The talk about De Leonism is all wrong. De Leonism is simply the synonym of S. L. P.ism. * * * I have only found two or three S. L. P. men who have read Marx' 'Capital' and talked about it understandingly." Again, the S. L. P. men "learn a few phrases about exploitation, surplus value, the great revolution, and especially about class-consciousness, repeat them on every occasion and call them science. In that way the most ignorant of men becomes a scientific Socialist in one evening. * * * The rest of their tactics can be told in a very few words. It is to denounce and vilify everybody who does not entirely agree with them. * * * In short their tactics are based upon fanaticism; but fanaticism and falsehood being twin brothers there is probably no other political organization where more untruth is told about opponents than in the S. L. P."

Again: "The ideal state of the S. L. P. provided it has any ideals, seems to be a communistic state controlled by hierarchy." Again: "Some may say that these things have changed since the revolution of July 10, 1899. * * * Nothing of the kind. * * * the

leopard has not changed its spots."

If these statements are true (and Berger claims to have known them for years) how misleading and treacherous is that Rochester letter which he indorsed, "extending a HEARTY invitation to your Convention as well as all members of your party (the S. L. P.) to join the S. D. P." Come in with your "De Leonism," your "ignorance," your "vilifying tactics," your "fanaticism and twin brother falsehood," your "hierarchy," your "leopard spots"—"but I implore the S. D. P. to vote no on the 'Manifesto.'"

Berger, the fourth member of the Joint Conference Committee who at present opposes union, and also a member of the N. E. B., has been among the most active opponent of union ever since the question has been under discussion. Berger is the editor of a German paper in Milwaukee and he has used it with all his power to prevent the two parties from coming together on honorable terms. He has resorted to the vilest of billingsgate. In referring to the S. D. P. comrades of New York, he says they are "calves led by a butcher" (meaning Butscher of the S. D. P.) He refers to Carey as the ward politician, Jim Carey of Haverhill. He styles Hillquit "a thorough class-conscious lawyer of New York," a "Polish apple Jew," a "Moses Hilkowitz," a "rabbinical candidate." He refers to Harriman as a "Tammany politician of the seventeenth degree," and his nomination at the Rochester convention is characterized as "a trial which Satan has sent upon poor Job to test the patience of the righteous one from California." The language he uses in regard to Hoehn of St. Louis is too foul for reproduction. Yet this same Berger, in the "Social Democratic Herald" of April 28, says he OPPOSES UNION BECAUSE "the way all negotiations have been conducted by the S. L. P. is a fresh confirmation of the old tactics and SPIRIT." Will any one, after having read the above slanderous remarks, believe that a man capable of uttering them would oppose a union with any body of men because of their impure spirit? What a disgraceful manifestation of hypocrisy! He says the S. L. P. "leopard has not changed its spots." Has he changed his spots. Would it not be well for him to pull the beam out of his own eye before he plucks the mote from his brother's eye? Will any one believe that he opposes union on the grounds of spirituality?

Cox signed that Rochester letter in which the National Executive Board "extends a hearty invitation to your Convention as well as to all members of your (S. L. P.) party to join the S. D. P."—because, in the "Herald" of April 28, as he says, "the parties occupy different fields," with whom we (the S. D. P.) "could not at that time or in the near future act in harmony," or with whom "association would be intolerable." Surely no one will question that Cox convicts himself of duplicity and "unscrupulous trickery" and spiritual depravity.

Again, in the "Herald" of April 14, one Backus says: "I need not repeat the details of the conspiracy by which it was sought, by chicanery, double-dealing, duplicity, and deceit to annihilate, destroy, and wipe out the S. D. P." Wonderful, is it not, what one finds in the débris when he digs! Again, April 21, Cox says: "The propaganda of the S. L. P. was largely a matter of vituperation, misrepresentation, and scurrilous abuse. * * * There is no evidence that the men of either faction of the S. L. P. have changed their character or their tactics. * * * Association with such men as these would be intolerable."

Again, Mrs. Brown, who was admitted to Cox' position on the N. E. B. when he resigned, says in the "Herald" of April 28, that "the qualifications entitling one to the privilege of membership in the S. L. P. were, generally speaking, inability to speak English, lack of good clothes and proximity to New York city. Deficiency in any one of these qualifications had to be made up in excess in one of the others. * * * We have a paper clean and free from malice." She seems to possess Cox' qualifications in a large

degree. Then she says "the intense desire to act wisely, the earnest wish to unite all (such) Socialists was uppermost in the minds of all. In that spirit the Committee on Union was elected." Let it be remembered (for Mrs. Brown remembers it well) that Berger held 190 proxies, Haile 230, MacCartney 260, and Stedman 40—in all 720. It was owing to this fact that Berger, Haile, Stedman, and Heath, all of whom were opposed to union, were elected. MacCartney would not go. Yes, it was "in that spirit."

THE REAL REASONS.

But since their charge of broken pledges and violation of instructions is groundless, since the revolt was a revolt of the N. E. B., and not a revolt of the membership, since the language of Mrs. Brown, Cox, Debs, Berger, Mrs. Haile, Backus, Stedman, and numerous others which might be cited if space permitted, shows that they are at best in no way spiritually superior to the S. L. P. members, and since every member of the N. E. B. has always opposed union and went to the Convention in that frame of mind, the "Manifesto" notwithstanding, it becomes of vital importance to know WHY they opposed union.

In determining this matter we will make no accusations. We will only deal with the facts and take the words out of their own mouths to prove the facts. Before starting in with the evidence, we will state what we are to prove. That will enable the reader to follow the thread more easily. We will prove seven points, namely, that the N. E. B. wanted:

1. The "S. D. Herald" as the party organ sent free to the membership.
2. The seat located in Chicago.
3. The present N. E. B. continued in power.
4. The head of the ticket to be chosen from the S. D. P.
5. No union.
6. Political fusion.
7. They wanted the public to believe that the N. E. B. wanted union.

We will not take each of these propositions up separately, but will permit each man to tell his own story, letting him prove as much as he will. We will call Stedman first to give in his evidence.

He says (see "Herald," April 21) that "on the first ballot for the seat, Chicago received one vote." Stedman cast that vote. Also he says: "It cannot be denied that in New York the S. L. P. are at war with each other * * * and the S. D. P. is far from harmonious. Considering these facts, would it not be suicidal to place your N. E. B. in a hotbed of internal discord." Debs says (see "Herald," April 21) that "the Chicago S. L. P. comrades have no use for S. D. P. comrades and hold them in contempt, and it should also be said that the S. D. P. have no use for the S. L. P. comrades." If it would be suicidal to place the seat of the National Executive in a hotbed of discord in New York, would it not also be suicidal to place it in a hotbed of discord in Chicago? This is precisely why the committee put the seat in Springfield. There is no discord among the comrades of either party there, nor yet between the parties. But if it is suicidal to place the seat in a "hotbed of discord" why did Stedman vote first for the "hotbed" of Chicago, and afterwards for the "hotbed" of New York? Why did he whisper across the table to Mrs. Haile, telling her to vote for New York, and that he would submit a minority report. Harriman confesses to the crime of having seen the "trick." But why the "trick?" Let Stedman speak. (See "Herald," April 21), "Harriman and Hillquit say they (S. L. P.) yielded the most important points—location, N. E. C., etc. Comrades, you have the shell (Springfield) they have the oyster (New York)." Stedman voted for the "oyster," Chicago. The "oyster," Chicago, is one of the propositions in his proposed minority report. Any one who will peruse the majority report will see that neither party can control the N. E. C. as at present arranged. First Stedman votes for the suicidal Chicago oyster, second for the suicidal New York oyster, but for Springfield, never. Stedman's goal (and he has company) seems to be oysters first,

last, and all the time. Oysters, suicide or no suicide. Again, he says (see "Herald," April 21): "Comrades, you may respond to the call to those who have attacked you for twenty months." Again, "I have favored union, proposed joint mass meetings," etc. If the attacks of the last twenty months are good reasons why the comrades should remain away from the S. L. P., then why was Stedman proposing union meetings? If the attacks were of such little importance that he passed them by when they were made, why does he think the comrades should take notice of them now? The fact is, it is only an effort to make men believe he has been in favor of union, while he has shown by his actions in the Convention, and in the Joint Conference Committee, and by the Rochester letter, that he opposes union.

For the present we will dismiss Stedman and call upon Mrs. Haile; but as the reader passes from the one to the other, he will kindly write on the tablet of his memory "Chicago oysters—I'm for union with twenty months' persecution—vote no."

Mrs. Haile says (see "Herald," May 5): "1. The S. D. P. was getting along all right before the question of union was ever heard of, and I believe even yet is destined to become the Socialist party of the country. * * * 2. Our N. E. B. would be blotted out. * * * 3. Our national organ abolished. * * * 4. The management of the national affairs of the party taken out of the hands of those who had the ability to bring the party up from nothing to its present standing." Again (see "Herald," April 2): "We would rather yield the national headquarters and the party name than not to have our official organ sent to the membership free. We believe this to be the strongest feature of the organization." It certainly has proven to be the strongest feature during the "thundering revolt" of the N. E. B. Let the reader review the statement of Mrs. Haile's and he will get a front view of four of the "suicidal Chicago oysters," buoyant with hope, and ambition, with the parent oyster in the center of the bed, namely, the "management of the national affairs taken out of the hands of the present N.E.B.," if THE SEAT IS MOVED FROM "DISCORDANT" CHICAGO." These statements are of importance for the reason that she has always opposed union, and has worked hand in glove with the N. E. B. in all their struggles against union. They do not seem to have learned of the latest scientific discoveries of rapid communication. There are three: "Telegraph," "Telephone," "Tellowoman."

We will next call Heath to the stand. In the "Herald" of May 12, he says that the S. D. P. committee of the first Joint Conference saw, first, "a plan adroitly laid to take the movement as far away as possible from the environment in which it had grown to lusty strength (Chicago.) 2. The headquarters tucked away in a corner. 3. The 'S. D. Herald' throttled and (4) the name wiped off the map." In his red book he says the rank and file of the S. L. P. are making overtures to the S. D. P., and the two bodies will probably come together under the banner of the S. D. P. He endorsed the Rochester letter.

If the reader will now observe these statements of Heath, who is a member of the N. E. B., he will see the same "oysters" of which Mrs. Haile spoke, with a marked growth, namely, "under the S. D. P. banner." Suppose an honorable union were effected and the seat were removed from Chicago, what would become of the "oysters?" Do you not see the anxious and almost craven look in the eyes of the N. E. B. as they proclaim their "thundering revolt?"

Jesse Cox, then a member of the N. E. B., says: "If the report of the Joint Conference Committee be adopted, the NAME, POLICY, ORGANIZATION and NATIONAL ORGAN of the S. D. P. will be extinguished."

Berger says, in his "Wahrheit," that "the name S. D. P. must stand, and Chicago must remain as seat of the party as a precedent to union." In the first issue of his paper after the

Convention, he said: "The Convention decided to retain its name and to absorb the S. L. P." Again, in the "Herald" of April 28, he says: "Now you will understand the course of the older Social Democrats and the NATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD. Certainly WE WANTED UNION, but we wanted a union that would wipe S. L. P.ism off the earth."

It was with these ends in view that he endorsed the Rochester letter "extending a hearty invitation to your Convention and all the members of the S. L. P. to join the S. D. P." But when the S. L. P. refused to "join," forgave the insult and proposed an honorable union, he rose up in arms against it; and his entire article in the "Herald" of April 28, and columns of matter in his "Wahrheit" oppose union, not by arguing the merits and demerits of union, nor of the name, seat, party organ, or N. E. B., but by misrepresenting the S. L. P." His "leopard spots," "fanaticism and twin brother falsehood," "ward politician," "Polish apple Jew," "Tammany politician of the seventeenth degree," have been referred to among other spiritual effusions of the N. E. B. But in this connection it becomes plain why they were used to conceal the real issue.

Mrs. Brown, the new member of the N. E. B., has always opposed union, and says in the "Herald," April 28: "We have an organization, the S. D. P., that is growing, an executive who have done well, a paper clean and free from malice," headquarters in the storm center of the revolution. * * * Let all Socialists come and help us push the standard of Socialism as high as possible during the coming campaign; then let us meet again and try to understand each other." The reader will observe the same issues from this new member of the N. E. B. as from all the rest. "Good N. E. B.," "party organ," seat of headquarters, "no union," "political fusion"—a pretense of union, but not now, in the sweet bye and bye.

Why does she not discuss the issues instead of misrepresenting the S. L. P., as was shown under the heading of spirits?

From Heath and Stedman and Berger and Cox and Mrs. Haile and Mrs. Brown such an effort would have done but little harm and would soon have been forgotten. But the other member of the N. E. B. also opposed union and has thereby made this statement imperative. He above all others should tell the real reasons why union was opposed, for it is he who says: "I claim the full share of the odium, if there be any, not from any sense of self-sacrifice, but because I endorse the action of the Board." (See "Herald," April 21.)

Debs says, in the "Herald" of April 21: "Until the S. D. P. is rescued from the maelstrom which threatens to engulf it, I am opposed to union on any terms. * * * I have arrived at my conclusions after the most mature deliberations of which I am capable. * * * I am opposed to union because I favor unity. * * * For months I have been doing all I consistently could to harmonize the two parties and to pave the way to unification."

Now read his Kansas City letter of January 14 and in the "Herald" of January 20: "It is my settled conviction that the hour for union has not arrived. * * * There is an element in the S. L. P. with whom we can have no affiliation without inviting disruption. * * * The anti-De Leon party hated De Leon, not because of his principles or lack of principles, but because he was their master at their own game." And speaking of The People and of a letter in The People which he knows the party and the editor disclaims, and which is, after all, not as severe as his own comments, he says: "I care nothing about these lies nor their craven authors, but I want no affiliation with such serpents of defamation." If this is true, why that Rochester letter three weeks later? And is this the way he has been working for the last six months to "harmonize the two parties and to pave the way to unification?" Does it not appear that such insults would tend to arouse the indignation of the active

members of the S. L. P., by whom such things are always seen, and tend to make them oppose union, while his constant professions in favor of union and the Rochester letter would tend to lead the rank and file to think that he favored union and cause them to abandon the S. L. P. and join the S. D. P.? Was this really the purpose? In the "Herald" of April 21, Debs says: "The high-minded toleration of the S. D. P. made its complete supremacy as the Socialist party of America only a question of months. * * * I am opposed to union at this time, and shall vote against it, and also against the report of the majority and use my best efforts to defeat both." Not to change the provisions, but to defeat them. Why? Because honorable union means to him the "OVERTHROW OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC DOMINATION. * * * The very life of the S. D. P. is threatened" (see "Herald," April 21.) Certainly; and so with the S. L. P. as a party. Again: "The S. L. P. would scorn the suggestion of union did they not see the handwriting on the wall." Again, in his Kansas City letter, Debs says: "We are not egotistical when we say there will soon be a united party and that without taking any chances. * * * The S. D. P. has proven its right to live. * * * It is moving majestically to the front. * * * The election of 1900 will indicate its standing and establish its supremacy." Again (see "Herald," April 21): "I propose to stand by the Social Democratic Party until conditions favor union" and "Social Democratic DOMINATION * * * and complete SUPREMACY * * * and my judgment is that this consummation will not be deferred long AFTER THE NATIONAL CAMPAIGN. * * * I have arrived at my conclusions after mature deliberation." I shall not desert when the party needs me. * * * I shall not resign the nomination at this time. * * * I stand ready to work in harmony with the S. L. P. * * * if they are willing to agree on candidates." Here you have Debs in his own language declaring against union unless the S. D. P. shall gain "COMPLETE DOMINATION and supremacy." Is that union or absorption without "taking chances" of losing personal power and preference? Is not that precisely what Berger proposes when he said "Now you see why the N. E. B. wanted a union that would wipe S. L. P.ism off the face of the earth?" Berger spoke advisedly, for every member of the N. E. B. has said the same. First, the seat at Chicago; second, the N. E. B. retained; third, the "Herald" as party organ; fourth, no union; fifth, head of the ticket; sixth, political fusion; seventh, we want the people to believe that we want union, but the time is not ripe.

So do all politicians and capitalists profess to want Socialism—but "the time is not ripe" and in the mean time they hold the reins of power.

Had the seven proposition above mentioned been placed in the "Manifesto," as in all justice to the membership they should have been, how many supporters would have rallied to that "thundering revolt" manufactured in the headquarters of the S. D. P. in Chicago by the N. E. B.? The charges of "broken pledges" and "violated instructions" and the long articles on the "bigotry, hate, virus, fanaticism, falsehood, ignorance," on the "ghoulish, wolfish, hawkish" Socialist Labor Party were, as it now appears, only written to conceal the real issue stated above and to gratify personal ambitions.

And are these petty personal ambitions to stand in the way of the union of forces and destroy the efficiency of a great movement?

But the men who want the seat in Chicago, the N. E. B. retained, the "Herald" as party organ, the head of the ticket, the S. L. P.ism "wiped off the face of the earth," and the "COMPLETE SUPREMACY OF THE S. D. P. DOMINATION ESTABLISHED"—they also want political fusion. Let us examine why.

At present the S. D. P. has not cast a sufficient number of votes to make it a legal political party in any state

in the union. The strength of the S. L. P. is largely in the northeast, extending as far west as Chicago (excepting Indiana); and it is also strong in California. The analysis of the S. D. P. vote shows that the S. D. P.'s organized strength is largely in the same district. The vote in this district showed a majority for union. Some states have already united and in all probability the comrades will unite in all the rest. This leaves the N. E. B. with the poorly organized states in the middle West, where the Middle-of-the-Road Populists have a strong grip on the radical element, where the Socialist movement is weak and where it will require great exertion on the part of either the S. L. P. or the S. D. P. to put up state tickets. It is therefore evident that since all the Eastern states, together with California, where the greatest strength exists, are practically solid for the united party, and since the S. L. P. men of the Middle West are also solid for union, it leaves the N. E. B. revolt in a precarious condition—in such a precarious condition that they cannot put up a ticket in a great many of the very best states.

But if the N. E. B. scheme were adopted, and the two parties agreed upon candidates without uniting, the N. E. B. electoral candidates could be put up in many states in the Union, and in this way all the S. L. P. votes would be counted for their party and they would gain legal recognition in a great many states this campaign. The head of the ticket being an S. D. P. and the second an S. L. P., all the work and impetus of the campaign would go to the credit of the S. D. P., and, as Barnes says, "those in favor of union would do the work and cast the votes, and those opposed would count them." Thus would "the S. L. P. be wiped off the face of the earth" by absorption and thus "the election of 1900 would completely establish the supremacy of the S. D. P. domination," with the seat in Chicago, the "Herald" as party organ, the N. E. B. in power, with the "oyster" well in hand.

The S. L. P. does not want political fusion; it does not want absorption; but it DOES WANT AN HONORABLE ORGANIC UNION. It has fought for it in the past, it is fighting for it at the present, it will fight for it in the future; and it will win. And the same is true of the S. D. P., with the exception of the National Executive Board and a few of its co-workers.

CONCLUSION.

Since the charges made in the "Manifesto" by the N. E. B. have been proven to be absolutely false and without just foundation, and since by reason of those charges and other misrepresentations there has been caused a disruption in the negotiations for union, it is only just that the facts should determine what the real charges should be and against whom they should rest.

1. The fourteen members of the Committee who have always favored union, have submitted their report according to party instructions to a referendum vote of their respective parties. The four members of the Committee who have always opposed union, and who led the S. D. P. to believe that they favored union, are at the present time, contrary to instructions, endeavoring to prevent their party from voting upon the Committee's report. We charge them with having broken faith, betrayed their trust and with having deceived and misled the membership of their party.

2. It has been shown that the majority of the N. E. B. were opposed to union when they went to the Indianapolis Convention. The N. E. B. led the Convention to believe that they "were favorable to an honorable union with perhaps a single exception" and thereby secured their own election to the Joint Conference Committee. By their words they are convicted of duplicity and of a willful falsehood, and of having misled and deceived their constituency the second time.

3. The majority of the N. E. B. were members of the Joint Conference Com-

mittee. Because they could not control that Committee, they deserted it, and used the power vested in them as the N. E. B. for the purpose of defeating the will of the party by taking a snap vote on false issues. We charge them with a "violation of instructions," and a flagrant usurpation of power, and with having misled and deceived their constituency the third time.

4. The N. E. B. charged the S. D. P. delegates with having "violated instructions" and the S. L. P. delegates with having broken their pledges. It has been shown that at least Stedman, Heath and Berger knew these charges to have been false when they signed them. They stand convicted of having knowingly deceived and misled the membership the fourth time.

5. The N. E. B. stated in the "Manifesto" that the only thing in the way of a perfect union at Indianapolis was the question of name. At the Joint Conference in New York, May 20, a majority of the N. E. B., Stedman, Berger, and Debs, were informed that the S. L. P. had voted for the name S. D. P. The fact that they still opposed union proves that the name was not the real issue. They stand convicted of misrepresentation and of having deceived and misled their constituency for the fifth time.

6. The party in "mass convention" elected the Committee of Nine for the specific purpose of negotiating on union with a like S. L. P. committee, and gave them instructions to submit the result of their deliberations to the party for adoption or rejection. The N. E. B. who were elected by the same body, for a different purpose, and a majority of whom belonged to the Unity Committee, endeavored to take the business of the party out of the hands of the party on the pretext of saving the party from a revolt of the party. They stand convicted of a culpable usurpation of power, of abrogating the fundamental political principles of their party, of endeavoring to rob their party of its most sacred rights, "the referendum," and of deceiving and misleading the constituency for the sixth time.

7. It has been shown that the real issues were the "seat in Chicago," the "Herald" as a "party organ," "the N. E. B. retained in power" and incidentally the "name." The N. E. B. and each of them urged the party to vote against union on one or all of the following grounds: i. e., of "broken pledges," "violated instructions," "impending revolt" and the "vicious spirit of the S. L. P." Every one of which has been proven to be false. They stand convicted of having concealed the real issue, of taking the vote on false issues, and of having deceived and misled their constituency the seventh time.

8. The party in convention decided in favor of an honorable union with the S. L. P. that the solidarity of the movement might be accomplished. The N. E. B. disregarded this decision and endeavored to defeat the parties' will and instead of union proposed political fusion in order to continue themselves in power. They stand convicted of treason to the movement, a sordid political ambition and of being now in the act of deceiving and misleading their constituency for the eighth time, and we trust for the last time.

In the meantime let us put our shoulders to the wheel, complete our organization and let the battle cry be: "Socialists of all parties—unite! You have nothing to lose but your petty party pride, and a powerful movement to gain."

The Joint Committee on Unity.
For the S. D. P.:

JAMES F. CAREY,
JOHN C. CHASE,
G. A. HOEHN,
WM. P. LONERGAN,
WM. BUTSCHER, Sec.

For the S. L. P.:

J. MAHLON BARNES,
G. B. BENHAM,
CHAS. E. FENNER,
JOB HARRIMAN,
MAX S. HAYES,
MORRIS HILLQUIT,
F. A. SIEVERMAN,
W. E. WHITE,
N. I. STONE, Sec'y.